

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are requested. Claims 1 - 16 are pending in the present application.

Rejection of Claims 1-16 Under Section 102

The Examiner rejects claims 1-16 under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,805,672 to Barkat et al. ("Barkat et al."). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Barkat et al. do not anticipate or teach each element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a voice-operated arrangement for interacting with a DTMF-controlled system. The Examiner asserts that col. 5, lines 10 - 30 of Barkat et al. disclose the following limitation of claim 1:

retrieving dial-out information for a DTMF-controlled system associated with the user and completing a communication path between the user and said associated DTMF-controlled system, wherein said voice-operated arrangement monitors the communication path and retrieves predetermined voice commands uttered by the user and translates said predetermined voice prompts into DTMF tones which are thereafter transmitted to said associated DTMF-controlled system.

Applicants assert, however, that there are several limitations recited in this phrase that are not taught by Barkat et al. Barkat et al. essentially teaches a "call Mom" hands free system, wherein the user can store a phone number for "Mom" and then retrieve and call that phone number via saying "call Mom." The voice recognition unit 30 of Barkat et al. merely provides recognition of the name of the person to be called (i.e., "mom") and then sends the correct dialing sequence to the dialer 39 to provide a dialing signal to the cellular telephone. Col. 3, lines 43 - 51. Once the call is established in Barkat et al., the voice recognition unit 30 enters a standby mode and the conversation continues between the person talking into the cellular phone and person receiving the call. Col. 5, lines 48 - 58. This is the "conversation mode" of the disclosure in Barkat et al. This is an important feature of Barkat et al. as will be discussed below.

There is no disclosure in Barkat et al. of retrieving dial-out information for a DTMF-controlled system associated with the user. For example, the cellular phone as disclosed in Barkat et al. is not a DTMF-controlled system as is recited in claim 1. When a generic telephone number is dialed in Barkat et al., it is simply an outgoing telephone call from a cellular phone to a person. There is no indication that the outgoing call is to a DTMF-controlled system that is associated with the user in any way. Claim 1 recites that the speech-to-DTMF tones application completes a communication path between the user and the associated DTMF-controlled system. The cellular phone disclosed by Barkat et al. completes the dialing procedure and establishes communication between the caller and the called party. Col. 5, lines 27 - 30. When comparing the operation of the cellular phone of Barkat et al. with the features recited in claim 1, it becomes clear that the cellular phone cannot be equated with either the claimed speech-to-DTMF tones application or the DTMF-controlled system. The function and structure of the limitations of claim 1 differ from the disclosure of Barkat et al.

In claim 1, after the speech-to-DTMF tones application completes a communication path between the user and the associated DTMF-controlled system, the speech-to-DTMF tones application monitors the communication path, retrieves voice commands from the user and translates the voice prompts into DTMF tones which are then transmitted to the DTMF-controlled system. As mentioned above, this operation differs dramatically from Barkat et al., wherein they teach that the voice recognition unit 30 enters a standby mode after the cellular phone establishes communication between the caller and the called party. Col. 5, lines 48 - 58. This is the "conversation mode" of the disclosure in Barkat et al. This feature is important because it essentially teaches away from the present invention which requires the speech-to-DTMF tones application to continue monitoring the communication path to retrieve further speech commands for translation into DTMF tones.

In this regard, Barkat et al. fail to disclose or suggest, once the communication between the user and the DTMF-controlled system is established, monitoring the communication path and retrieving further voice commands uttered by the user to translate the further voice commands into DTMF tones that are transmitted to the associated DTMF-controlled system. In Barkat et al., the purpose of the voice recognition unit 30 is simply over once the call is established. This is in sharp contrast to claim 1 which requires a continual monitoring of the communication path for additional voice commands from the user. These further voice commands are translated into DTMF tones and are transmitted to the DTMF-controlled system. Such an arrangement is simply not taught by Barkat et al.

Applicants note that the amendments to claim 1 with regards to this limitation are for clarification and consistency (i.e., changing the word "prompts" to "commands"). The limitation, whether before or after amendment, still is not taught by Barkat et al. and therefore this amendment is not for patentability and does not narrow the claim scope.

Claims 2-7 each depend from claim 1 and recite further limitations therefrom. Applicants submit that claim 1 provides ample reasons for patentability and therefore the dependent claims are patentable as well.

Claim 8 is a method claims that is rejected also by reference to Barkat et al., column 3. Applicants submit that there are numerous elements not taught by Barkat et al. For example, element c) recites dialing out to a DTMF-controlled system included in the user record retrieved in step b). Barkat et al. fail to disclose or suggest dialing out to a DTMF-controlled system included in the user record retrieved in step b). As discussed above, Barkat et al. only disclose obtaining a telephone number from memory associated with a voice command like "call Mom" and dialing out that phone number. For these and other reasons as set forth above, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 9 and claim 10 each depend from claim 8 and recite further limitations therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable as well and are in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that claims 11 - 16 also recite limitations not taught by the prior art of record and requests a Notice of Allowance for these claims as well as claims 1 - 10.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed the rejection of claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/2/04

By: Thomas M. Isaacson

Correspondence Address:
Samuel H. Dworetzky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Thomas M. Isaacson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,166
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433